APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/501,082	07/09/2004	Yasushi Katayama	254519US6PCT	3119

22850   7590   04/27/2009
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
MUSA, ABDELNABI O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2446	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/27/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	10/501,082	KATAYAMA, YASUSHI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ABDELNABI O. MUSA	2446	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _02 December 2008_.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _9,11,12,21,23,24 and 27_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _9,11,12,21,23,24 and 27_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _09 July 2004_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☒ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

        1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Acknowledgment is made for the applicant's response and amendment filed on

12/02/2008.

Remarks

2.   Claims 1-8, 10, 13-20, 22 and 25-26 have been canceled from the instant

application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 9, 21, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Abe et al. Pub. No (US. 2002/0069408 A1) in view of Jeyachandran et al. Patent

No. (US 6,567,176 B1).

As per **claim 9** Abe teaches an information processing apparatus comprising:

a data reception unit (355);

a rule decision processing unit (22) configured to determine whether data

processing (44) based on a data processing request (S470,413) received via the data

reception unit (355) is to be executed (a rule decision processing unit as to whether the

entry should be processed according to the output table in FIG.15 [0172] [0205]

FIG.19); and

a data processing unit (44) configured to execute data processing based on the determination of the rule decision processing unit (22) (a data processing unit configured to process information [0274] [0316] [0258] FIG.25), wherein

the rule decision processing unit (22) is configured to execute determination processing for determining whether or not the processing according to the processing request is (determine processing information in according with the request [0070]) to be executed based on a rule deciding condition (22) descriptor (the decision processing unit determines whether or not the commercial messages should be processed [0172] [0206] FIG.19), and the rule deciding condition descriptor (information descriptors [0367] [0387] [0389]) is determined based on a probability (103) value (processing information based on a commercial messages probability value extracted form database [0247] [0258] FIG.23; determining whether on not the request is to be executed; i.e. not always processing/outputting the information [0083])

Abe fails to teach the specifics on how the processing requests are handled in each unit and how processing information determined by the rule decision unit from the data processing unit to the data reception unit is executed in servers or computer units.

However, Jeyachandran teaches an information processing apparatus that is one of a plurality of apparatuses that communicate with each other, one apparatus outputting information in response to the receipt of an instruction from another apparatus, or based on a request that is requesting a required process from another apparatus, the method includes an optimum planning unit 206 makes an optimal plan for the execution of a jobs. A job execution determination unit 207 determines whether

a job should be executed, or when the job is to be executed that is based on the request inputted from other units, and determines whether another apparatus will execute the job. When another apparatus executes the job, another apparatus instruction unit 208 sends an a request with instruction to the other apparatus for the job execution. When the job is executed, an execution notification unit 210 notifies a user that the execution instruction has been issued to another apparatus based on their request. (Col.2, line 35-67 ; Col.15, Line 5-53; FIG.4) for example, consider, FIG. 12, at step S120 a check is performed to determine whether or not a job constitutes necessary information for a user based on their request. If this is true, the processes at step S122 and the following steps are performed. If not, at step S127 the job is canceled. At step S122, information concerning the advance notice that corresponds to the job type and conditions in FIG. 13 is referred to, or the contents described on a cover sheet are analyzed to determine whether or not a notice for the process to be executed and the contents of the process should be issued to a user prior to the performance of the instructed job (i.e. not always processing the request) When advance notice is not required, program control moves to step S126. When advance notice is issued, program control moves to step S124, whereat a user is notified of the process to be performed and its contents. At step S125, the permission for the performance is received from a user, if necessary. At step S126 the job is performed. (Col.18, line 64; FIG.12) in order to efficiently process information requests and reduce the load placed on a user when performing an operation to implement the objective of processing information (Col.15, Line 5-53; Col.18, line 64)

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Abe by the teaching of Jeyachandran to process requests based on their instructions and determine if each unit should process the information or redirect the processing request to other unit in order to efficiently process information requests and reduce the load placed on a user when performing an operation to implement the objective of processing information (Col.15, Line 5-53; Col.18, line 64)

As per **claim 21** Abe teaches a data processing method for analyzing a data processing request received via a data reception unit, and for determining whether the data processing request is to be executed, comprising:

a rule decision processing step (22) for determining whether data processing (44) based on the data processing request (S470) is to be executed (a rule decision processing unit as to whether the entry should be processed according to the output table in FIG.15 [0172] [0205] FIG.19); and

a data processing (44) step for executing data processing based on the determination of the rule decision processing step (a data processing unit configured to process information [0274] [0316] [0258] FIG.25), wherein

The rule decision processing step determines whether or not the processing according to the processing request is to be executed based on a rule deciding condition descriptor (the decision processing unit determines whether or not the commercial messages should be processed [0172] [0206] FIG.19), and the rule

deciding condition descriptor is determined based on a probability value (processing

information based on a commercial messages probability value extracted form database

[0247] [0258] FIG.23).

　　　　Abe fails to teach the specifics on how the processing requests are handled in

each unit and how processing information determined by the rule decision unit from the

data processing unit to the data reception unit is executed in servers or computer units.

　　　　However, Jeyachandran teaches an information processing apparatus that is one

of a plurality of apparatuses that communicate with each other, one apparatus

outputting information in response to the receipt of an instruction from another

apparatus, or based on a request that is requesting a required process from another

apparatus, the method includes an optimum planning unit 206 makes an optimal plan

for the execution of a jobs. A job execution determination unit 207 determines whether

a job should be executed, or when the job is to be executed that is based on the

request inputted from other units, and determines whether another apparatus will

execute the job. When another apparatus executes the job, another apparatus

instruction unit 208 sends an a request with instruction to the other apparatus for the

job execution. When the job is executed, an execution notification unit 210 notifies a

user that the execution instruction has been issued to another apparatus based on

their request. (Col.2, line 35-67 ; Col.15, Line 5-53; FIG.4) for example, consider, FIG.

12, at step S120 a check is performed to determine whether or not a job constitutes

necessary information for a user based on their request. If this is true, the processes

at step S122 and the following steps are performed. If not, at step S127 the job is

canceled. At step S122, information concerning the advance notice that corresponds

to the job type and conditions in FIG. 13 is referred to, or the contents described on a

cover sheet are analyzed to determine whether or not a notice for the process to be

executed and the contents of the process should be issued to a user prior to the

performance of the instructed job (i.e. not always processing the request) When

advance notice is not required, program control moves to step S126. When advance

notice is issued, program control moves to step S124, whereat a user is notified of the

process to be performed and its contents. At step S125, the permission for the

performance is received from a user, if necessary. At step S126 the job is performed.

(Col.18, line 64; FIG.12) in order to efficiently process information requests and reduce

the load placed on a user when performing an operation to implement the objective of

processing information (Col.15, Line 5-53; Col.18, line 64)

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skilled in the art at the

time the invention was made to have modified Abe by the teaching of Jeyachandran to

process requests based on their instructions and determine if each unit should process

the information or redirect the processing request to other unit in order to efficiently

process information requests and reduce the load placed on a user when performing

an operation to implement the objective of processing information (Col.15, Line 5-53;

Col.18, line 64)

As per **claim 27** Abe teaches A computer-readable storage medium including a

computer program for analyzing a data processing request received via a data reception

unit, and for determining whether the data processing request is to be executed, when executed by a processor, causes the process to perform a method comprising:

a rule decision processing (22) step for determining whether the data processing (44) based on the data processing request (S470) is to be executed; and

a data processing (44) step for executing the data processing based on the determination of the rule decision processing step (a rule decision processing unit as to whether the entry should be processed according to the output table in FIG.15 [0172] [0205] FIG.19), wherein

The rule decision processing step determines whether or not the processing according to the processing request is to be executed based on a rule deciding condition descriptor (the decision processing unit determines whether or not the commercial messages should be processed [0172] [0206] FIG.19), and the rule deciding condition descriptor is determined based on a probability value (information descriptors [0367] [0387] [0389]) is determined based on a probability (103) value (processing information based on a commercial messages probability value extracted form database [0247] [0258] FIG.23).

Abe fails to teach the specifics on how the processing requests are handled in each unit and how processing information determined by the rule decision unit from the data processing unit to the data reception unit is executed in servers or computer units.

However, Jeyachandran teaches an information processing apparatus that is one of a plurality of apparatuses that communicate with each other, one apparatus outputting information in response to the receipt of an instruction from another

apparatus, or based on a request that is requesting a required process from another apparatus, the method includes an optimum planning unit 206 makes an optimal plan for the execution of a jobs. A job execution determination unit 207 determines whether a job should be executed, or when the job is to be executed that is based on the request inputted from other units, and determines whether another apparatus will execute the job. When another apparatus executes the job, another apparatus instruction unit 208 sends an request with instruction to the other apparatus for the job execution. When the job is executed, an execution notification unit 210 notifies a user that the execution instruction has been issued to another apparatus based on their request. (Col.2, line 35-67 ; Col.15, Line 5-53; FIG.4) for example, consider, FIG. 12, at step S120 a check is performed to determine whether or not a job constitutes necessary information for a user based on their request. If this is true, the processes at step S122 and the following steps are performed. If not, at step S127 the job is canceled. At step S122, information concerning the advance notice that corresponds to the job type and conditions in FIG. 13 is referred to, or the contents described on a cover sheet are analyzed to determine whether or not a notice for the process to be executed and the contents of the process should be issued to a user prior to the performance of the instructed job (i.e. not always processing the request) When advance notice is not required, program control moves to step S126. When advance notice is issued, program control moves to step S124, whereat a user is notified of the process to be performed and its contents. At step S125, the permission for the performance is received from a user, if necessary. At step S126 the job is performed.

(Col.18, line 64; FIG.12) in order to efficiently process information requests and reduce

the load placed on a user when performing an operation to implement the objective of

processing information (Col.15, Line 5-53; Col.18, line 64)

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skilled in the art at

the time the invention was made to have modified Abe by the teaching of Jeyachandran

to process requests based on their instructions and determine if each unit should

process the information or redirect the processing request to other unit in order to

efficiently process information requests and reduce the load placed on a user when

performing an operation to implement the objective of processing information (Col.15,

Line 5-53; Col.18, line 64)

4.   Claims 11-12 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Abe et al. Pub. No (US. 2002/0069408 A1) in view of Freed et al.

Patent No. (US 7,073,055 B1) further in view of Jeyachandran et al. Patent No. (US

6,567,176 B1).

As per **claim 11** the modified Abe teaches the information processing apparatus

according to claim 9, wherein:

said rule deciding condition (22) descriptor (information descriptors [0367] [0387]

[0389]) is included in a data processing (44) request (S470, 413); and

 said rule decision processing unit (22) is configured to generate a random number

 (206) (information transmission reception system comprising transmission means for

generating and sending out a transmission signal [0008][0017] FIG.26), and to execute

determining processing for determining whether or not the processing according to a

processing request is to be executed based on a comparison (204) between the

generated random number (206) and said rule deciding condition (22) descriptor

(information descriptors [0367] [0387] [0389])

      The modified Abe fails to teach the specifics on generating a random number for

the rule decision processing unit to determine the data destination.

      However, Freed teaches a random number chosen used to associate messages

and responses between a client and a server (Table-1 FIG.1 Col.4, line 10)

      It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skilled in the art at the

time the invention was made to have modified the modified Abe by the teaching of

Freed, because one would have to implement a rule decision condition (i.e. judgment

unit, router or any processor that distinguish data destinations), a reception and/or

transmission units in communications with computer networks/servers to process

information. The rule decision condition unit would have to generate a number to

associate messages to be forwarded to the intended recipient

      As per **claim 12** the modified Abe teaches the information processing apparatus

according to claim 9, wherein:

      said rule deciding condition (22) descriptor (information descriptors [0367] [0387]

[0389]) is included in a data processing (44) request (413); and

said rule decision processing unit (22) is configured to perform hash value

calculation (20) processing based on the data processing request (S470,413) storing

data (103,11), and to execute determining processing (44)for determining whether or

not the processing according to a processing request is to be executed based on a

comparison between a calculated hash value and a setting value set in its own

apparatus in advance (comparing pre-set signal with generated signal [0008] [0013]

FIG.33)

The modified Abe fails to teach the specifics on performing hash value

calculation processing.

However, Freed teaches the processing method uses hash functions for creating

and verifying a digital signature (Col.14, line 61; Col.20, Line 55 FIG.1)

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skilled in the art at the

time the invention was made to have modified the modified Abe by the teaching of

Freed, because one would have to implement a rule decision condition (i.e. judgment

unit, router or any processor that distinguish data destinations), a reception and/or

transmission units in communications with computer networks/servers to process

information. The rule decision condition unit would have to perform a hash function

value calculation to determine the execution of data based on the hash result.

As per **claim 23** the modified Abe teaches the data processing method according

to claim 21, wherein:

said rule deciding condition descriptor is included in the data processing request (information transmission reception system comprising transmission means for generating and sending out a transmission signal [0008] [0017] FIG.26); and said rule decision processing step generates a random number and determines whether or not the processing according to the processing request is to be executed based on a comparison between the generated random number and the said rule deciding condition descriptor (information descriptors [0367] [0387] [0389])

The modified Abe fails to teach the specifics on generating a random number for the rule decision processing unit to determine the data destination.

However, Freed teaches a random number chosen used to associate messages and responses between a client and a server (Table-1 FIG.1 Col.4, line 10)

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the modified Abe by the teaching of Freed, because one would have to implement a rule decision condition (i.e. judgment unit, router or any processor that distinguish data destinations), a reception and/or transmission units in communications with computer networks/servers to process information. The rule decision condition unit would have to generate a number to associate messages to be forwarded to the intended recipient

As per **claim 24** the modified Abe teaches the data processing method according to claim 21, wherein:

said rule deciding condition (22) descriptor information descriptors [0367] [0387] [0389]) is included in the data processing request (413); and

said rule decision processing step executes hash value calculation processing (44) based on the data processing request storing data, and determines whether or not processing according to the processing request is to be executed based on a comparison between a calculated hash value and a setting value set in its own apparatus in advance (comparing pre-set signal with generated signal [0008] [0013] FIG.33)

The modified Abe fails to teach the specifics on performing hash value calculation processing.

However, Freed teaches the processing method uses hash functions for creating and verifying a digital signature (Col.14, line 61; Col.20, Line 55 FIG.1)

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the modified Abe by the teaching of Freed, because one would have to implement a rule decision condition (i.e. judgment unit, router or any processor that distinguish data destinations), a reception and/or transmission units in communications with computer networks/servers to process information. The rule decision condition unit would have to perform a hash function value calculation to determine the execution of data based on the hash result.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments with respect to the above treated claim(s) have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

When responding to this office action, Applicant is advised to clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present, in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. He or she must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections See 37 CFR 1.111(c).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abdelnabi O. Musa whose telephone number is 571-2701901. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Thru Friday: 7:30am to 5:00pm (EST).

    If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Pwu can be reached on 571-2726798. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

    Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. O. M./
Examiner, Art Unit 2446

/Jeffrey Pwu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2446